



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/943,773	08/30/2001	Shinako Matsuyama	09792909-5133	2470

26263 7590 05/27/2005

SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. BOX 061080
WACKER DRIVE STATION, SEARS TOWER
CHICAGO, IL 60606-1080

EXAMINER

LIPMAN, JACOB

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2134

DATE MAILED: 05/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/943,773	Applicant(s) MATSUYAMA ET AL.	
	Examiner Jacob Lipman	Art Unit 2134	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 March 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

ML

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of claims 1-14 in the reply filed on 28 March 2005 is acknowledged.

Oath/Declaration

2. The oath or declaration is defective. A new oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.67(a) identifying this application by application number and filing date is required. See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

The oath or declaration is defective because:

It does not identify the residence of each inventor. The oath must identify the mailing address, and the residence if an inventor lives at a location which is different from where the inventor customarily receives mail, of each inventor. The residence may be provided in an application data sheet or a supplemental oath or declaration. See 37 CFR 1.63(c) and 37 CFR 1.76.

Specification

3. The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claim Objections

4. Claim 5 is objected to because of the following informalities: The word "sail" should be "said". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

Art Unit: 2134

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claim 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "each of which is generated". It is unclear what is referred to by "each of which" here.

Claim 5 recites the limitation "distribution of the content key for encrypting the content stored in said secure container". The content in said secure container is already encrypted by this key, and it is unclear what further encryption is being claimed here.

Claim 7 recites the limitation "the content key stored in said container". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Regarding claim 10, the phrase "such as" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8. Claims 1-10, 12, and 14, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rose et al., US Patent number 5,708,709.

Art Unit: 2134

9. With regard to claim 1 and 12, Rose discloses a distribution system (column 9 lines 9-12) including a plurality of user devices, a secure container (column 9 line 41) containing encrypted content (column 9 lines 46-50) and condition information (column 10 lines 36-42), distributing the container by transmission (column 9 lines 54-56), performing person authentication (column 9 line 66-column 10 line 3) based on a person ID referenced to an ID list (column 10 lines 4-7), where the container includes the ID list.

With regard to claim 2, Rose discloses storing the container to local memory (column 9 lines 54-56).

With regard to claim 3, Rose discloses the control information includes conditions for processing secondary distribution (expiration date).

With regard to claims 4 and 5, Rose discloses the user ID is compared with the ID listed in the container (column 10 lines 4-17).

With regard to claim 6, Rose discloses after verification, the program may be loaded for execution in the client's computer (column 10 lines 21-29)

With regard to claim 7, Rose discloses the key is available to the client (column 10 lines 21-29).

With regard to claim 8, Rose discloses the container is stored before verification (column 9 lines 54-56).

With regard to claim 9, Rose discloses the user is being verified (column 10 lines 25-29).

With regard to claim 10, Rose discloses the container contains user permissions (column 10 lines 43-53).

With regard to claim 14, Rose discloses the ID is created from the user's card (column 7 lines 9-26).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 11 and 13, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rose.

With regard to claims 11 and 13, Rose discloses the content distribution system, as outlined above, but does not mention adding a digital signature to the container. The examiner takes official notice that adding a signature to distributed data is common to protect the receiver from harmful executables. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to sign the container disclosed by Rose to increase the receiver's security and trust.

Conclusion


12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jacob Lipman whose telephone number is 571-272-3837. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 7 AM-3 PM.

Art Unit: 2134

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Morse can be reached on 571-272-3838. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JL


GREGORY MORSE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNICAL FIELD: ELECTRONICS